



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,192	12/30/2000	Douglas M. Neuse	044601.0164	9997

7590 03/16/2004

GEORGE R. SCHULTZ P.C.  
One Lincoln Centre  
5400 LBJ Freeway, Suite 525  
DALLAS, TX 75240

EXAMINER
----------

ZHEN, WEI Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/753,192

Applicant(s)

NEUSE ET AL.

Examiner

Wei Y Zhen

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2122

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-21 are pending.

***Election/Restriction***

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-19, drawn to source to source code translation, classified in class 717, subclass 137.
  - II. Claims 19-21, drawn to simulation modeling, classified in class 703, subclass 22.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because for example, claim 1 is recited with converting code. The subcombination has separate utility such as simulation modeling.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with David Odom on 3/3/2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-18. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 19-21 withdrawn

Art Unit: 2122

from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "The method of claim 11, *wherein the step of developing an object data structure* includes developing an object data structure containing a data structure of the non-object oriented computer environment". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The Examiner is interpreting this limitation as "The method of claim 11, *further includes* developing an object data structure containing a data structure of the non-object oriented computer environment".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2122

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dupuy et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,523,171 in view of Agesen et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,253,215.

As per claim 1, Dupuy et al disclose

Identifying an existing object oriented environment, identifying the non-object oriented computer environment, (col. 3 lines 11-15); defining requirements for the new object oriented computer environment, selecting grammar and syntax compatible with the non-object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 19-22); preparing the new object oriented computer environment, wherein the new object oriented computer environment includes the requirements, the grammar and syntax and object oriented extensions (col. 3 lines 27-26, Fig. 2 col. 4 lines 15-52).

Dupuy et al does not explicitly disclose developing object oriented extension, wherein an existing application of the non-object oriented computer environment remains executable and wherein the new object oriented computer environment access information of the non-object oriented computer environment.

However, Agesen et al disclose developing object oriented extension, wherein an existing application of the non-object oriented computer environment remains executable and wherein the new object oriented computer environment access information of the non-object oriented computer environment (col. 2 lines 15-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Agesen et al into the teaching of Dupuy et al to develop object oriented extension, wherein an existing application of the non-object oriented computer

environment remains executable and wherein the new object oriented computer environment access information of the non-object oriented computer environment because one would want to provides a flexible system which can access both types of environments.

As per claim 2, Dupuy et al disclose identifying a commercially available object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 6-10).

As per claim 3, Dupuy et al discloses identifying a legacy non-object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 6-10).

As per claims 4-8, Dupuy et al disclose legacy non-object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 11-15).

Dupuy does not explicitly disclose the legacy non-object oriented computer environment, includes a user language interface and data structure, allows multiple users, includes a distributed environment, allows simulation modeling for analysis of the performance of software.

Official Notice is taken that a user language interface and data structure, allows multiple users, includes a distributed environment, allows simulation modeling for analysis of the performance of software were well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Therefore,, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge into the teaching of Dupuy et al to have the legacy system to include a user language interface and data structure, allow multiple users, include a distributed environment, allow simulation modeling for analysis of the performance of software because one would want to have a complex computer system to meets various types of needs of different users.

As per claim 9, Dupuy et al discloses selecting semantics of the non-object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 19-22, 27-35).

As per claim 10, Dupuy et al discloses selecting semantics compatible to the non-object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 19-22 and 27-35).

As per claim 11, Dupuy et al discloses selecting the semantics of the existing object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 27-35, Fig. 2 and col. 4 lines 15-52).

As per claims 12-13, Dupuy does not explicitly disclose developing an object header structure, and an object data structure.

Official Notice is taken that an object header structure, and an object data structure were well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Therefore,, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of the well known knowledge into the teaching of Dupuy et al to develop an object header structure, and an object data structure because one would want to utilize the object oriented technology to develop a complex computer system to meets various types of needs of different users.

As per claim 14, Dupuy et al discloses developing an object data structure containing a data structure of the non-object oriented computer environment (col. 3 lines 37- col. 4 line 7).

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 15, Dupuy et al disclose developing general purpose utility classes (col. 4 lines 22-25).

As per claim 16, Dupuy et al discloses creating new code (col. 3 lines 27-26, Fig. 2 col. 4 lines 15-52, col. 4 lines 22-25).

As per claim 17, Dupuy et al discloses preparing the new object oriented computer environment including inherently creating an operating system (col. 3 lines 27-26, Fig. 2 col. 4 lines 15-52).

As per claim 18, Dupuy et al discloses wherein the new object oriented computer environment includes an object oriented computer language (col. 3 lines 4-15).

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wei Y Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 2122

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Wei Zhen  
Primary Patent Examiner  
March 10, 2004